# IPV PIC

### Text

#### A. Do the aff minus the phrase “domestic violence”

### Competition

#### B. Mutually Exclusive, you can’t sever out of your reps

#### Representations must precede policy discussion. Crawford 02,

Neta Crawford ,PhD MA MIT, BA Brown, Prof. of poli sci at boston univ. Argument and Change in World Politics, 2002 p. 19-21

Coherent arguments are unlikely to take place unless and until actors, at least on some level, agree on what they are arguing about. The at least temporary resolution of meta-arguments- regarding the nature of the good (the content of prescriptive norms); what is out there, the way we know the world, how we decide between competing beliefs (ontology and epistemology); and the nature of the situation at hand( the proper frame or representation)- must occur before specific arguments that could lead to decision and action may take place. Meta-arguments over epistemology and ontology, relatively rare, occur in instances where there is a fundamental clash between belief systems and not simply a debate within a belief system. Such arguments over the nature of the world and how we come to know it are particularly rare in politics though they are more frequent in religion and science. Meta-arguments over the “good” are contests over what it is good and right to do, and even how we know the good and the right. They are about the nature of the good, specifically, defining the qualities of “good” so that we know good when we see it and do it. Ethical arguments are about how to do good in a particular situation. More common are meta-arguments over representations or frames- about how we out to understand a particular situation. Sometimes actors agree on how they see a situation. More often there are different possible interpretations. Thomas Homer-Dixon and Roger karapin suggest, “Argument and debate occur when people try to gain acceptance for their interpretation of the world”. For example, “is the war defensive or aggressive?”. Defining and controlling representations and images, or the frame, affects whether one thinks there is an issue at stake and whether a particular argument applies to the case. An actor fighting a defensive war is within international law; an aggressor may legitimately be subject to sanctions. Framing and reframing involve mimesis or putting forward representations of what is going on. In mimetic meta-arguments, actors who are struggling to characterize or frame the situation accomplish their ends by drawing vivid pictures of the “reality” through exaggeration, analogy, or differentiation. Representations of a situation do not re-produce accurately so much as they creatively re-present situations in a way that makes sense. “mimesis is a metaphoric or ‘iconic argumentation of the real.’ Imitating not the effectivity of events but their logical structure and meaning.” Certain features are emphasized and others de-emphasized or completely ignored as their situation is recharacterized or reframed. Representation thus becomes a “constraint on reasoning in that it limits understanding to a specific organization of conceptual knowledge.” The dominant representation delimits which arguments will be considered legitimate, framing how actors see possibities. As Roxanne Doty argues, “the possibility of practices presupposes the ability of an agent to imagine certain courses of action. Certain background meanings, kinds of social actors and relationships, must already be in place.” If, as Donald Sylvan and Stuart Thorson argue, “politics involves the selective privileging of representations, “it may not matter whether one representation or another is true or not. Emphasizing whether frames articulate accurate or inaccurate perceptions misses the rhetorical import of representation- how frames affect what is seen or not seen, and subsequent choices. Meta-arguments over representation are thus crucial elements of political argument because an actor’s arguments about what to do will be more persuasive if their characterization or framing of the situation holds sway. But, as Rodger Payne suggests, “No frame is an omnipotent persuasive tool that can be decisively wielded by norm entrepreneurs without serious political wrangling.” Hence framing is a meta-argument.

#### This is empirically proven- the language associated with intimate partner violence is crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al 08:

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of [intimate partner] violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ [intimate partner] violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding **definitions**, they **are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

#### [Extra] Speech acts matter – holding debaters for their reps means they can say whatever without consequences.

**Vincent 13**

Chris Vincent, Re-Conceptualizing our Performances: Accountability in Lincoln Douglas Debate, Vbriefly, 2013.

The question then becomes how does our discourse justify what we believe? For many debaters it is the gaming aspect of debate that allows us to assume that our speech can be disconnected from the speech act. The speech can be defined as the arguments that are placed on the flow, and is evaluated in the context of what is the most logical and rational argument to win the round. The critical distinction is the speech act, which is the performance of that discourse. It’s not what you say, but what you justify. Understanding the speech act requires critically assessing the ramifications of the debaters discourse. Debate is in and of itself a performance. To claim that it is not is to be divorced from the reality of what we do. We must evaluate what a debaters performance does and justifies. For white debaters it is easy to view the discourse as detached from the body. For those with privilege in debate, they are never forced to have their performance attached to them but instead their arguments are viewed as words on paper. They are taught to separate themselves from any ideologies and beliefs, and feel that there is no consequence to what they say. It becomes the way in which they justify what is deemed as “rational” and “logical” thought. The argument sounds like it will be competitive so it is read but it is deemed as just an argument. Judges evaluate this as just a speech. This becomes what I deem as a performance by the body, rather than a performance of the body. Performances by the body allow debaters to not be held accountable to the words they say. Words are seen as divorced from any meaning outside of the flow, versus the performance of the body where the words are attached to the body itself. Debaters often insert the performance by the body, when they make arguments that they claim that they do not believe, but think it is the best strategy for the round. This is a false assumption, since for black debaters meaning is always connected to their bodies. The best strategy should never be one that at the same time justifies acts of racism.

### C. Net benefits

#### First, the term “domestic” creates hetero-normative tendencies excluding LGBT victims--- the domestic violence laws in California proves. Fountain 2:

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

―Intimate Partner Violence‖ and ―Domestic Violence‖ - Distinctions Between the Terms Use of the term “domestic violence” to describe violence in LGBTQ intimate relationships has been disfavored by some feminist researchers. They contend that **the language of “domesticity” reflects the patriarchy and hetero-normative tendencies of the law from which it springs, obscuring the dimensions of gender and power at play. These tendencies have various expressions in state law, but even those with provisions around LGBTQ intimate partnerships tend exhibit some form of sanctioned discrimination in either text or practice**. For example, **in order to access a legal remedy under California‟s Domestic Violence Protection Act** (“DVPA”), **one must fall into one of the Act‟s categories of “protected persons,” as well as demonstrate, to the Court‟s satisfaction, “reasonable proof of a past act or acts of abuse.”** Categories of “protected persons” under the Act include being the Spouse, Cohabitant, Co-parent, Child, or Blood relative to the alleged perpetrator, or sharing a Dating or Engagement Relationship with the alleged perpetrator. Thus, there is no conduct which alone is sufficient to satisfy the extension of domestic civil protection orders; whatever proofs the alleged victim provides of a past act (or acts) of abuse by the alleged perpetrator, no protection order will be granted without establishing also that the relationship between the alleged victim and the alleged perpetrator is one which the Act anticipated in crafting the law.

#### That turns case because LGBTQ intimate partnerships are excluded from this frame of consideration, so they aren’t protected, increasing discriminatory abuse.

#### Second, the term “domestic” justifies continued violence against the victim because it “domesticizes” the private sphere, which makes laws more hesitant and less effective. Rivera:

Jenny Rivera [Professor of Law at the City University of New York] Violence Against Women Act and the Construction of Multiple Consciousness in the Civil Rights and Feminist Movement,”, 1995. FD

Violence against women by intimate partners is commonly referred to as “domestic violence.” In previous articles, I have voiced my opposition to the use of **the word “domestic” as a qualifier for this category of violence** because it **characterizes violence against women** by current and former spouces and lovers **as** **sufficiently distinct from all other forms of violence** so **as to justify** wholly different, sometimes, **inadequate**, **sanctioning of such violence**. See Jenny Rivera, Domestic Violence Against Latinas by Latino Males: An Analysis of Race, National Origin, and Gender Differentials, 14 B.C. Third World L.J.231, 232 n.5 (1994) [hereinafter domestic Violene against Latinas]; Jenny Rivera, Puerto Rico’s Domestic Violence Prevention and Intervention Law and the United States Violence Against Women Act of 1994: The Limitations of Legislative Responses, 5 Colum. J. Gender & L. 78, 79 n.8 (1995) [hereinafter Puerto Rico’s Domestic Violence Law]. Undeniably, violence against women by these categories of perpretrators is different from other violence crimes commited by strangers or nonintimate acquantances and relatives. However, **the use of “domestic” as a qualifying term does more than simply categorize based on the status of the abuser. This terminology has**, in effect, **“domesticized” the very act of violence and** **facilitated the insulation of this violence from public scrutiny and criminalized**. See Elizabeth M. Schneider, The Violence of Privacy, 24 CONN. L. Rev. 973, 977 (1991) (“**thus, in the so-called private sphere of domestic and family life, which is purportedly immune from law, there is always the selective application of law**. Signifincantly**, the selective application of law invokes ‘privacy’ a a rationalte for immunity in order to protect male domination**.”)

#### TURNS case because the aff’s rhetoric entrenches the public/private dichotomy allowing for continued abuse.

#### Third, the term “domestic violence” disguises the criminal nature of the violence. Only the term intimate partner violence solves. Douglas -

Heather Douglas “Crime in the intimate sphere: prosecutions of intimate partner violence” 7 newscastle l. rev 80 (2004)

In this paper I have eschewed the use of **the term ‘domestic violence’**, this term has suffered criticism in recent times. It has been suggested that the use of the term ultimately **hampers further enquiry as it denotes a status relationship as well as a special one, separate such violence out from and somehow modifying ordinary violence**. Others note that although **the term**, when it was initially contrived, was both radical and useful, it may now work to **trivialize the violence which broadly is occurring in the context of the home**. One judge recently noted that he disliked the term ‘domestic violence’ because **the term disguised its criminal nature**. It is thus difficult to know how to appropriately name the violence that is the subject of this paper. **Its relationship context and gendered nature is extremely relevant** and important **to understanding and dealing with it**. Rather than trivializing it, its status should be seen to exacerbate its seriousness, it is separate from other violence, it is worse. **This type of violence is** worse and **more serious than many other forms of violence because its perpetrators exploit the intimate knowledge they have of their victim** and because it frequently exploits a power imbalance between the parties. **As a result of these considerations I have used** **the term ‘intimate partner** violence’ to **denote** that **violence which takes place between those in** defacto or marriage relationships or those formerly in such **relationships**. Previous research has found that most DVOs are applied for by women against their male intimates or previous intimates (rather than by men against women). This research supports the view that violence against women by men in intimate relationships is more likely to occur and generally more serious than violence against men by women. The violence discussed here is very much about gender and relationship and this is played out in the fact scenarios I will discuss below. The reality for women continues to be that they are more likely to suffer violence from their intimate partner (or previous partner) than any other person.